

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN

Program Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Bakersfield to Los Angeles


BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES TECHNICAL EVALUATION

January 2004

Prepared for:

California High-Speed Rail Authority

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Railroad Administration



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal
Railroad
Administration**

**Bakersfield to Los Angeles
Biological Resources
Technical Evaluation**

Prepared by:

P&D Consultants, Inc.

999 Town & Country Road, 4th Floor
Orange, CA 92868

January 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	ALTERNATIVES	2
1.1.1	No-Project Alternative	2
1.1.2	Modal Alternative	4
1.1.3	High-Speed Train Alternative	4
2.0	BASELINE/AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	13
2.1	STUDY AREA	13
2.2	GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REGIONAL PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND VEGETATION COMMUNITIES	13
2.2.1	Physical Characteristics of the Region	13
2.2.2	Vegetation Communities Typical of the Region	13
2.3	SENSITIVE VEGETATION COMMUNITIES	20
2.3.1	Sensitive Plant Species	23
2.4	SENSITIVE WILDLIFE	36
2.4.1	Invertebrates	37
2.4.2	Fishes	37
2.4.3	Reptiles and Amphibians	38
2.4.4	Birds	41
2.4.5	Mammals	46
2.4.6	Wildlife Movement/Migration Corridors	53
2.5	JURISDICTIONAL WATERS AND WETLANDS	58
3.0	METHODS FOR BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES ANALYSIS	61
3.1	DATA COLLECTION	61
3.2	SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA FOR BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	62
3.3	IMPACT ASSESSMENT	62
4.0	IMPACTS TO BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES AND JURISDICTIONAL WATERS	64
4.1	NO-PROJECT ALTERNATIVE	64
4.1.1	Impacts to Biological Resources from I-5: SR-99 to SR-14	64
4.1.2	Impacts to Biological Resources from I-5: SR-14 to I-405	64
4.1.3	Impacts to Biological Resources from I-5: I-405 to Burbank	64
4.1.4	Impacts to Biological Resources from I-5: Burbank to LA Union Station	65
4.1.5	Impacts to Biological Resources from SR-58/14: SR-99 to Palmdale	65
4.1.6	Impacts to Biological Resources from SR-14: Palmdale to I-5	65
4.1.7	Impacts to Biological Resources from Airport Expansion	66
4.2	MODAL ALTERNATIVE	66
4.2.1	Potential Impacts to Biological Resources from Highway Expansion	66
4.2.2	Potential Impacts to Biological Resources from Airport Expansion	79
4.2.3	Summary of Impacts from the Modal Alternative	79
4.3	HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	80
4.3.1	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Wheeler Ridge Corridor	80

4.3.2	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Union Avenue Corridor	81
4.3.3	Impacts to Biological Resources from the I-5: Tehachapi Corridor	82
4.3.4	Impacts to Biological Resources from the SR-58 Corridor	89
4.3.5	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Antelope Valley Corridor	92
4.3.6	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Soledad Canyon Corridor	93
4.3.7	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Metrolink/UPRR: Sylmar Station North Segment	96
4.3.8	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Metrolink/UPRR: Sylmar Station to Burbank Airport Segment	97
4.3.9	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Burbank Airport to Downtown Burbank Segment	98
4.3.10	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Metrolink/UPRR: Glendale Segment	98
4.3.11	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Metrolink/UPRR: Over and Under I-5 and SR-110 Segment	99
4.3.12	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Metrolink/UPRR: Over I-5 and SR-110, South Section Segment	100
4.3.13	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Metrolink/UPRR: Under I-5 and SR-110, South Section Segment	101
4.3.14	Impacts to Biological Resources from the I-5: Glendale Segment	102
4.3.15	Impacts to Biological Resources from the I-5: Silverlake Aerial/Cut and Cover Option	104
4.3.16	Impacts to Biological Resources from the LAUS East Bank: North Segment ...	105
4.3.17	Impacts to Biological Resources from the LAUS Existing: East Segment	106
4.3.18	Impacts to Biological Resources from the LAUS Existing: South Segment	107
4.3.19	Impacts to Biological Resources from the East Connection	108
4.3.20	Impacts to Biological Resources from the South Connection	108
4.3.21	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Palmdale Station Siding	109
4.3.22	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Metrolink/UPRR: Sylmar Station Siding	110
4.3.23	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Burbank Airport Station Siding	111
4.3.24	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Metrolink/UPRR: Burbank Downtown Station Siding	112
4.3.25	Impacts to Biological Resources from the I-5: Burbank Downtown Siding	113
4.3.26	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Burbank Downtown Station Siding..	114
4.3.27	Impacts to Biological Resources from the LAUS Existing Siding	115
4.3.28	Impacts to Biological Resources from the LAUS South Siding	115
4.3.29	Impacts to Biological Resources from the LAUS East Bank Siding	116
4.3.30	Impacts to Biological Resources from the Maintenance Yard	117

5.0 PREPARERS 119

6.0 SOURCES OF DATA/INFORMATION 121

LIST OF FIGURES

1.2-1	NO-PROJECT ALTERNATIVE – CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.....	3
1.2-2	MODAL ALTERNATIVE – HIGHWAY COMPONENT	5
1.2-3	MODAL ALTERNATIVE – AVIATION COMPONENT	6
1.2-4	HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE – CORRIDORS AND STATIONS FOR CONTINUED INVESTIGATION	7
1.2-5A	HST BAKERSFIELD-TO-LA SEGMENTS	8
1.2-5B	HST BAKERSFIELD-TO-LA SEGMENTS	9
1.2-6A	HST BAKERSFIELD-TO-LA CONSTRUCTION TYPE	10
1.2-6B	HST BAKERSFIELD-TO-LA CONSTRUCTION TYPE	11
2.2-1	REPRESENTATIVE PHOTOGRAPHS OF VEGETATION COMMUNITIES: BAKERSFIELD-TO-LOS ANGELES	15
2.4-1	WILDLIFE MOVEMENT/MIGRATION CORRIDORS IN THE STUDY AREA	56

LIST OF TABLES

1.2-1	LENGTHS OF CONSTRUCTION TYPE BY HST SEGMENT	12
2.3-1	SENSITIVE PLANT SPECIES POTENTIALLY OCCURRING IN THE BAKERSFIELD-TO-LOS ANGELES REGION OF THE HIGH SPEED RAIL PROJECT	32
2.4-1	SENSITIVE WILDLIFE SPECIES POTENTIALLY OCCURRING IN THE BAKERSFIELD-TO-LOS ANGELES REGION OF THE HIGH SPEED RAIL PROJECT	48
4.2-1	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS IN THE I-5: SR-99 TO SR-14 SEGMENT OF THE MODAL ALTERNATIVE.....	68
4.2-2	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS IN THE I-5: I-405 TO BURBANK SEGMENT OF THE MODAL ALTERNATIVE.....	76
4.2-3	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS IN THE I-5: BURBANK TO LA UNION STATION OF THE MODAL ALTERNATIVE	77
4.2-4	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS IN THE SR-14: PALMDALE TO I-5 SEGMENT OF THE MODAL ALTERNATIVE.....	79
4.3-1	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS IN THE WHEELER RIDGE CORRIDOR OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	81
4.3-2	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS IN THE UNION AVENUE CORRIDOR OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	82
4.3-3	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE I-5: TEHACHAPI CORRIDOR OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	84
4.3-4	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE SR-58 CORRIDOR OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE.....	90
4.3-5	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE ANTELOPE VALLEY CORRIDOR OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	93
4.3-6	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE SOLEDAD CANYON CORRIDOR OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	95
4.3-7	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE METROLINK/UPRR: SYLMAR METROLINK STATION TO BURBANK AIRPORT SEGMENT OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE.....	98
4.3-8	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE METROLINK/UPRR: OVER AND UNDER I-5 AND SR-110 SEGMENT OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	100
4.3-9	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE METROLINK/UPRR: OVER I-5 AND SR-110, SOUTH SECTION SEGMENT OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	101
4.3-10	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE METROLINK/UPRR: UNDER I-5 AND SR-110,	

	SOUTH SECTION SEGMENT OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	102
4.3-11	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE I-5: GLENDALE SEGMENT OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	103
4.3-12	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE I-5: SILVERLAKE AERIAL/CUT AND COVER OPTION OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE.....	104
4.3-13	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE LAUS EAST BANK: NORTH SEGMENT OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	105
4.3-14	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE LAUS EXISTING: EAST SEGMENT OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	106
4.3-15	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE LAUS EXISTING: SOUTH SEGMENT OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	107
4.3-16	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE SOUTH CONNECTION OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE.....	109
4.3-17	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE METROLINK/UPRR: SYLMAR STATION SIDING OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	111
4.3-18	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE BURBANK AIRPORT STATION SIDING OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	112
4.3-19	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE METROLINK/UPRR: BURBANK DOWNTOWN STATION SIDING OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	113
4.3-20	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE BURBANK DOWNTOWN STATION SIDING OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	115
4.3-21	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE LAUS SOUTH SIDING OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE.....	116
4.3-22	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE LAUS EAST BANK SIDING OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE	117
4.3-23	SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL WATERS FROM THE MAINTENANCE YARD OF THE HIGH-SPEED TRAIN ALTERNATIVE.....	118

ACRONYMS

CDFG	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
CDPR	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
CEQ	COUNCIL OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
CEQA	CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
CESA	CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT
CFR	CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS
CNDDB	CALIFORNIA NATURAL DIVERSITY DATABASE
CSC	CALIFORNIA SPECIES OF SPECIAL CONCERN
CWA	CLEAN WATER ACT
EIR	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
EIS	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
EO	EXECUTIVE ORDER
EPA	UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
FAA	FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
FE	FEDERAL LISTED; ENDANGERED
FESA	FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT
FHWA	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
FPE	FEDERAL PROPOSED ENDANGERED
FPT	FEDERAL PROPOSED THREATENED
FRA	FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
FSOC	FEDERAL SPECIES OF CONCERN
FT	FEDERAL LISTED; THREATENED
FTA	FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION
LAUS	LOS ANGELES UNION STATION
LOSSAN	LOS ANGELES TO SAN DIEGO
MBTA	MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY ACT
NEPA	NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT
NMFS	NATIONAL MARINE AND FISHERIES SERVICE
NPPA	NATIVE PLANT PROTECTION ACT
NWI	NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY
PFO	POTENTIAL FOR OCCURRENCE
RTPs	REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANS
RWQCB	REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
SE	STATE LISTED; ENDANGERED
SEA(s)	SIGNIFICANT ECOLOGICAL AREA(S)
ST	STATE LISTED; THREATENED
STIP	STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
USACE	UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
USFWS	UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) was created by the Legislature in 1996 to develop a plan for the construction, operation, and financing of a statewide, intercity high-speed passenger train system.¹ After completing a number of initial studies over the past six years to assess the feasibility of a high-speed train system in California and to evaluate the potential ridership for a variety of alternative corridors and station areas, the Authority recommended the evaluation of a proposed high-speed train system as the logical next step in the development of California's transportation infrastructure. The Authority does not have responsibility for other intercity transportation systems or facilities, such as expanded highways, or improvements to airports or passenger rail or transit used for intercity trips.

The Authority adopted a *Final Business Plan* in June 2000, which reviewed the economic feasibility of a 1,127-kilometer-long (700-mile-long) high-speed train system. This system would be capable of speeds in excess of 321.8 kilometers per hour (200 miles per hour [mph]) on a dedicated, fully grade-separated track with state-of-the-art safety, signaling, and automated train control systems. The system described would connect and serve the major metropolitan areas of California, extending from Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area, through the Central Valley, to Los Angeles and San Diego. The high-speed train system is projected to carry a minimum of 42 million passengers annually (32 million intercity trips and 10 million commuter trips) by the year 2020.

Following the adoption of the Business Plan, the appropriate next step for the Authority to take in the pursuit of a high-speed train system is to satisfy the environmental review process required by federal and state laws which will in turn enable public agencies to select and approve a high speed rail system, define mitigation strategies, obtain necessary approvals, and obtain financial assistance necessary to implement a high speed rail system. For example, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) may be requested by the Authority to issue a *Rule of Particular Applicability*, which establishes safety standards for the high-speed train system for speeds over 200 mph, and for the potential shared use of rail corridors.

The Authority is both the project sponsor and the lead agency for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements. The Authority has determined that a Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is the appropriate CEQA document for the project at this conceptual stage of planning and decision-making, which would include selecting a preferred corridor and station locations for future right-of-way preservation and identifying potential phasing options. No permits are being sought for this phase of environmental review. Later stages of project development would include project-specific detailed environmental documents to assess the impacts of the alternative alignments and stations in those segments of the system that are ready for implementation.

The decisions of federal agencies, particularly the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) related to high-speed train systems, would constitute major federal actions regarding environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). NEPA requires federal agencies to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) if the proposed action has the potential to cause significant environmental impacts. The proposed action in California warrants the preparation of a Tier 1 Program-level EIS under NEPA, due to the nature and scope of the comprehensive high-speed train system proposed by the Authority, the need to narrow the range of alternatives, and the need to protect/preserve right-of-way in the future. FRA is the federal lead agency for the preparation of the Program EIS, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are cooperating federal agencies for the EIS.

¹ Chapter 796 of the Statutes of 1996; SB 1420, Kopp and Costa

A combined Program EIR/EIS is to be prepared under the supervision and direction of the FRA and the Authority in conjunction with the federal cooperating agencies. It is intended that other federal, state, regional, and local agencies will use the Program EIR/EIS in reviewing the proposed program and developing feasible and practicable programmatic mitigation strategies and analysis expectations for the Tier 2 detailed environmental review process which would be expected to follow any approval of a high-speed train system.

The statewide high-speed train system has been divided into five regions for study: Bay Area-Merced, Sacramento-Bakersfield, Bakersfield-Los Angeles, Los Angeles-San Diego via the Inland Empire, and Los Angeles-Orange County-San Diego. This Biological Resources Technical Evaluation for the [name of region] is one of five such reports being prepared for each of the regions on the topic, and it is one of fifteen technical reports for this region. This report will be summarized in the Program EIR/EIS and it will be part of the administrative record supporting the environmental review of alternatives.

1.1 ALTERNATIVES

1.1.1 No-Project Alternative

The No-Project Alternative serves as the baseline for the comparison of Modal and High-Speed Train Alternatives (Figure 1.2-1). The No-Project Alternative represents the state's transportation system (highway, air, and conventional rail) as it existed in 1999-2000 and as it would be after implementation of programs or projects currently programmed for implementation and projects that are expected to be funded by 2020. The No-Project Alternative addresses the geographic area serving the same intercity travel market as the proposed high-speed train (generally from Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area, through the Central Valley, to Los Angeles and San Diego). The No-Project Alternative satisfies the statutory requirements under CEQA and NEPA for an alternative that does not include any new action or project beyond what is already committed.

The No-Project Alternative defines the existing and future statewide intercity transportation system based on programmed and funded (already in funded programs/financially constrained plans) improvements to the intercity transportation system through 2020, according to the following sources of information:

- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
- Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) for all modes of travel
- Airport plans
- Intercity passenger rail plans (California Rail Plan 2001-2010, Amtrak Five- and Twenty-year Plans)

The No-Project Alternative for the Bakersfield-Los Angeles region includes no programmed improvements to highways or airports except for programmed widening of SR-14 between Avenue P-8 and Avenue L in Antelope Valley within the existing right-of-way.

As with all of the alternatives, the No-Project Alternative will be assessed against the purpose and need topics/objectives for congestion, safety, air pollution, reliability, and travel times.

Figure 1.2-1



1.1.2 Modal Alternative

There are currently only three main options for intercity travel between the major urban areas of San Diego, Los Angeles, the Central Valley, San Jose, Oakland/San Francisco, and Sacramento: vehicles on the interstate highway system and state highways, commercial airlines serving airports between San Diego and Sacramento and the Bay Area, and conventional passenger trains (Amtrak) on freight and/or commuter rail tracks. The Modal/System Alternative consists of expansion of highways, airports, and intercity and commuter rail systems serving the markets identified for the High-Speed Train Alternative (Figures 1.2-2 and 1.2-3). The Modal Alternative uses the same inter-city travel demand (not capacity) assumed under the high-end sensitivity analysis completed for the high-speed train ridership in 2020. This same travel demand is assigned to the highways and airports and passenger rail described under the No-Project Alternative, and the additional improvements or expansion of facilities is assumed to meet the demand, regardless of funding potential and without high-speed train service as part of the system.

The Modal Alternative for the Bakersfield-Los Angeles region includes the following improvements:

Highways

- I-5: SR-99 to SR-14 (Widen 2 lanes)
- I-5: SR-14 to I-405 (Double-deck 4 lanes)
- I-5: I-405 to Burbank (Widen 4 lanes)
- I-5: Burbank to LA Union Station (Widen 4 lanes)
- SR-58/14: SR-99 to Palmdale (No widening)
- SR-14: Palmdale to I-5 (Widen 2 lanes)

Airports

- Burbank (9.9 additional MAP, 19 new gates, 1 new runway, 1 new access)

1.1.3 High-Speed Train Alternative

The Authority has defined a statewide high-speed train (HST) system capable of speeds in excess of 200 miles per hour (mph) (320 kilometers per hour [km/h]) on dedicated, fully grade-separated tracks, with state-of-the-art safety, signaling, and automated train control systems. State of the art high speed steel-wheel-on-steel-rail technology is being considered for the system that would serve the major metropolitan centers of California, extending from Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area, through the Central Valley, to Los Angeles and San Diego (Figure 1.2-4).

The High-Speed Train Alternative includes several corridor and station options. A steel-wheel on steel-rail, electrified train, primarily on exclusive right-of-way with small portions of the route on shared track with other rail is planned. Conventional "non-electric" improvements are also being considered along the existing LOSSAN rail corridor from Los Angeles to San Diego. The train track would be either at-grade, in an open trench or tunnel, or on an elevated guideway, depending on terrain and physical constraints.

For purposes of comparative analysis, the HST corridors will be described from station-to-station within each region, except where a by-pass option is considered when the point of departure from the corridor will define the end of the corridor segment. Figures 1.2-5A and 1.2-5B show the HST segment names for the Bakersfield-to-LA region. Figures 1.2-6A and 1.2-6B show the HST construction types for the Bakersfield-to-LA region. Table 1.2-1 shows the lengths of each construction type within each HST segment.

Figure 1.2-2
Modal Alternative - Highway Component



Modal Alternative - Aviation Component




Figure 1.2-4
High-Speed Train Alternative –
Corridors and
Stations for Continued Investigation

